

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1 through 42 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 24, and 26 are amended. New claims 33 through 42 are added. Claims 8, 16, and 26 are indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, and 27-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ratchford, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,646,241) in view of Deans, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,562,980). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 9, 10, 17, and 24, thereby mooting the §103 rejection of claim 1 (and claims 2-7 depending therefrom), claim 9 (and claims 10-15 depending therefrom), claim 17 (and claims 18-23 depending therefrom), and claim 24 (and claims 25 and 27-32 depending therefrom).

Applicant further submits that the inventions set forth in the pending claims are not rendered obvious over Ratchford in view of Deans because these cited patents as a whole, alone or in combination, do not disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature required by the claims.

For example, the cited patents do not at least disclose, teach or suggest a resource integration program (claim 1), a system (claim 9), an interface (claim 17), or a method (claim 24) including, among other recited features, accessing simulation data, or computational fluid dynamics data, or wind tunnel test data, or any combination thereof when generating useful information for balancing flight loads.

Dependent claims 2-7, 10-15, 18-23, 25, and 27-32 are further patentably distinguishable over the cited patents in that the cited patents do not disclose, teach or suggest the additional features recited in the dependent claims.

For at least the above reasons, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the section 103 rejections of claims 1-7, 9-15, 17-25, and 27-32.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 8, 16, and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 8, 16, and 26 to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, claims 8, 16, and 26 should now be in condition for allowance.

NEW CLAIMS 33 THROUGH 42

New claims 33 through 42 are each supported by the application as originally filed. Accordingly, no new matter is introduced by the addition of new claims 33 through 42. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 33 through 42 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons given above in connection with the independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 24 from which they respectively depend.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned directly at (314) 726-7502.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 24, 2004

By: 

Anthony G. Fussner
Reg. No. 47,582
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
314-726-7500 (telephone)
314-726-7501 (facsimile)